



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 4, 2009

Ms. Dolores Alvarado Hibbs
General Counsel
Texas Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box 12847
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2009-12567

Dear Ms. Hibbs:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 354665 (TDA-PIR-09-466).

The Texas Department of Agriculture (the "department") received a request for the Request for Proposal ("RFP") for Broadband Mapping Project responses from eighteen named companies. You indicate that the department does not have any responsive information pertaining to fourteen of named companies.¹ You state that some of the requested information has been released to the requestor.² The department takes no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but states that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of BroadMap L3C and TSTCI Foundation Inc. ("TSTCI"), (collectively, the "third parties"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²You state that two of the companies with responsive information do not object to the release of their information.

attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received comments from TSTCI. We have considered the submitted comments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received any arguments from BroadMap L3C. We, thus, have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes BroadMap L3C's proprietary information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of BroadMap L3C.

TSTCI claims its information at issue is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, but has not directed our attention to any law under which any of the submitted information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101.³ *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). We therefore conclude that the department may not withhold any of TSTCI's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

TSTCI also raises section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from required public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. We note, however, that section 552.104 only protects the interests of a governmental body and is not designed to protect the interests of private parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8-9 (1991). In this instance, the department has not argued that the release of any portion of the submitted information would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation under section 552.104. Because the department has not submitted any arguments under section 552.104, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

³Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101.

TSTCI also claims its information is protected under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business [It may] relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.⁴ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of

⁴The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and other involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6.

Having considered TSTCI’s claim, we conclude that TSTCI has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its information at issue fits within the definition of a trade secret. TSTCI has also not sufficiently established any of the trade secret factors with respect to any of its information at issue. Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Additionally, we find that TSTCI has made only conclusory allegations that the release of the submitted information would result in substantial damage to TSTCI’s competitive position. Thus, TSTCI has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of its information at issue. *See id.* (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue). Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that most of BroadMap L3C’s information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). As no further exceptions are raised, the submitted information must be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php,

or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Laura Ream Lemus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LRL/jb

Ref: ID# 354665

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cammie Hughes
TSTCI Foundation, Inc.
5929 Balcones Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78731-4280
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel Perrone
BroadMap
3900 Westerre Parkway, Suite 300
Richmond, Virginia 23233
(w/o enclosures)